



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

teacher of mine, may be described as "the limbo of <pedagogical> curiosities". Necessary to the scholar this knowledge is; but in the Secondary Schools it has no place, save, perhaps, in the simple matter that the vowel before *nf* or *ns* is long by nature, or in such a familiar word as *contio*, where the etymology makes all plain. What remains need frighten no one—provided he has brains and is willing to use them for a little while. If one will master—and apply, every day, in his own private reading of Latin aloud, and in his class-room teaching—the rules for final syllables ending in *s*, and the 'exceptions' thereto that study and teaching of the declensions ought to make as familiar to one as the English alphabet is, if he will master—and apply—the rules for 'increment' in nouns and verbs, he will find that he can mark, correctly, in any Latin text, familiar or unfamiliar, the quantities of a very large percentage of the vowels. The quantity of the root vowel of a word must be memorized, but even here there are helps in plenty to the memory. Reading of earlier Latin or of the inscriptions will show such spellings, for instance, as *moerus*, *douco*, *deico*: if one notes such things, how can he be uncertain about the quantity of the *u* in *murus* and *duco*, of the *i* in *dico*? Derivation helps. If one connects *incido*, 'to cut into', with *caedo*, will he be uncertain about the quantity of the second *i* in this word?

What of reading Latin hexameters aloud? First of all let me make reference here to a very valuable discussion of the Latin hexameter, too little known to teachers of Latin. It is the chapter, labelled *Metre*, which Professor Kirby Smith contributed to the Introduction, pages lix–lxxii, of H. L. Wilson's edition of Juvenal (D. C. Heath and Co., 1903). Those who can read German—and this class should include every teacher of Latin—will find a wealth of additional matter in the works referred to by Professor Smith in his footnotes. For the teacher of Vergil a very valuable book is *The Metrical Licenses of Vergil*, by H. W. Johnston (Scott, Foresman and Co., Chicago, 1898).

C. K.

(To be concluded)

## REVIEWS

The *Scholia* on the *Aves* of Aristophanes. By John Williams White. Boston and London: Ginn and Co. (1914). Pp. cxii + 378. \$3.50.

Professor White has been a close student of Aristophanes for many years, as every classical scholar the world over knows. He had begun the study of the *scholia* of Aristophanes many years before the publication of the facsimile of the Venetus Manuscript (1902). In 1903, as he tells us in his Preface to the present volume, he was urged to publish what has since become this book. In three years the main body of the work (pages 1–303) was finished and electrotyped. The plates were "stored in the vaults of the Athenaeum Press", where they lay for about

eight years, for personal reasons. Fortunately for us all there were no 'worms of Sepsis' there, to play havoc with his work.

In a short Preface the editor calls attention to the many difficulties involved in understanding and appreciating Aristophanes to-day, difficulties lying in the fact that the substance of comedy is essentially local and especially so in the case of the comedies of Aristophanes. He then states the main thesis of the long Introduction that follows, that comedy was studied profitably at Alexandria for five hundred years, "from just after the foundation of the city to the end of the second century after Christ", and that about two centuries later there was composed—probably in Constantinople—a variorum edition of Aristophanes. That Professor White is to be ranked among conservative editors in general is seen in his vigorous and picturesque characterization of the pernicious charm that emendation possesses for the scholar:

Emendation is the most fascinating and demoralizing diversion that the classical scholar has been vouchsafed by his peculiar gods.

In the case of *scholia*, however, he feels that more editorial freedom must be allowed, and that oftentimes the "scalpel is the only instrument of salvation".

The editor renders thanks to those that have helped him with advice and conjecture—Mr. Stephen Byington, Professors Henry Jackson, Henry Wright, Edward Capps, and Charles B. Gulick, and Dr. Earnest Cary. Special thanks are tendered to Professor Capps for preparing the Indexes, of which more anon.

In the Introduction, about seventy-five pages are devoted to an elaborate and detailed account of the early students and editors of Aristophanes and his *scholia* and of the progress of Aristophanic knowledge down through the ages until the time of our manuscripts of the works of Aristophanes and of his *scholia*. Then follow about eighteen pages that deal with the manuscripts that appear in Professor White's critical apparatus.

In the first part of the Introduction, then, we find an account of the foundation of Alexandria, and of the early Ptolemies; of the establishment and situation of the Museum; of the beginning and size of the Library; of Callimachus, Eratosthenes, Aristophanes, Callistratus, Aristarchus, Didymus, and the other great students of comedy. Then we read more particularly of the work done on Aristophanes: of Zenodotus, who assigned to Lycophron the classification of the comic poets for the catalogue that Aristarchus himself was preparing; of Lycophron's treatise on comedy, and of other treatises; of Euphronius, who was the first scholar to give special attention to Aristophanes in a continuous commentary. The value of our *scholia* may be noted in part from the fact that this Euphronius is referred to or quoted a dozen times in the *scholia* of the *Aves*, generally for the meaning of a word or phrase or sentence, occasionally for facts

about a person. Differences in text, due to careless scribes, to actors, and to owners, brought about the need of a text revision. This was undertaken by Aristophanes of Byzantium. He is referred to six times in the scholia of the Aves; these references are mainly for matters of text, *σημεία*, or ordinary commentary. Callistratus, too, wrote a commentary on Aristophanes; he is referred to seven times in the scholia of the Aves; his interests covered a wide range. The great Aristarchus also wrote a commentary on Aristophanes; he is referred to only once in the scholia of the Aves, but many times in the scholia of other plays, particularly the *Ranae*.

The first scholar to compose a variorum edition of the Greek classics was Didymus, who lived in the last part of the first century B.C. Among his editions of this sort was one of Aristophanes. The interests of Didymus were largely literary, historical, biographical, and antiquarian, rather than linguistic. A second variorum commentary of Aristophanes was made by Symmachus, who lived about a hundred years after Didymus. Some centuries later an anonymous scholar made another compilation of these commentaries.

At this point Professor White discusses rather fully the great fire at Alexandria at the time of Julius Caesar's visit to that city. He does not accept the view of Wilamowitz that the Library was totally destroyed, nor does he agree with Mahaffy that the story of the burning of the Library is a fabrication. After giving the evidence in full and sifting it he comes to the conclusion that the Library was seriously damaged by fire, but that it was not burned down; and that the damage had been repaired before Strabo's visit. The only weak point in his case is the argument from the silence of Strabo. He reasons that, inasmuch as Strabo makes no mention of the Library, his silence . . . is intelligible on the assumption that the Library may have been seriously damaged, but had not burnt down and had been repaired. He was in Alexandria as a traveller, not as a student; the unique organization of the Museum attracted his attention; but if the Library in its immediate vicinity and all its books had been totally destroyed, he could hardly have failed to record so lamentable a catastrophe. But, surely the silence of Strabo would seem natural, if, as Mahaffy believes, the Library was not burned at all. And there might have been some reason for his silence that we do not know, even had the Library been totally destroyed.

After discussing the fire, the editor goes back to Didymus. He shows that there is no evidence to support the view that Didymus lived and taught at Rome, though this is given as a fact in some modern works; a conjectural emendation, by Schmidt, of a passage in Suidas has given color to this wrong belief. Moreover, Alexandria, with the addition of books brought from the Pergamene collection, would have furnished Didymus with the necessary library for his work, whereas Rome could not have supplied it. Then follows a brief survey of scholars who were

contemporaries or successors of Didymus—Aristonicus, Tryphon, Antigonos, Theon, Apion, Seleucus, Pamphilus, Antiochus, Epaphroditus, Ptolemy Chennus, Irenaeus, Amarantus, Nicanor, Aelius Theon, Apollonius Dyscolus, and Herodian.

Then the editor takes up briefly the subject of metrical science, calling attention to the fact that there were two theories that prevailed in ancient times; one "is Alexandrian", the other "is attributed to Varro". The Alexandrian system, which recognized "certain fundamental elements of rhythmical measurement", was maintained, in Imperial times, by Philoxenus, Heliodorus, and Hephaestion. Professor White comes to the conclusion that possibly Aristophanes of Byzantium, who was, we know, a great student of metrics, formulated the metrical system as handed down to us by Heliodorus and Hephaestion.

Next the editor discusses the relation of Symmachus and Didymus to each other. He proves, what was almost unanimously maintained before, that Symmachus followed Didymus and was the second variorum editor of the scholia. The way in which Symmachus refers to Didymus and quotes him in the extant scholia of the Aves sufficiently proves this. Besides, the final editor of these scholia had access to the commentary of Symmachus (and presumably not to that of Didymus), as is shown by the subscription to the scholia of the Aves: 'this was written out of <ἐκ> the scholia of Symmachus and others'. The exact date of Symmachus can not be fixed. Professor White suggests 100 A.D. "as a probable working hypothesis". The name of Symmachus appears twenty times in the scholia of the Aves in connection with his views. In fifteen of these the name of Didymus and his opinion are given; in thirteen Symmachus differs from Didymus. This shows that Symmachus was independent in his ideas, and suggests that he was probably influenced to make his edition from the feeling that the edition of Didymus was inaccurate. His notes cover various subjects—accent, quantity, form of words, manuscript readings, matters of history, biography, etc.

Contrary to Wilamowitz and Susemihl Professor White maintains that the commentaries of Didymus and of Symmachus were "independent books, unaccompanied by the text but provided with lemmata". The evidence for this, which is given in detail and which, to the reviewer, seems absolutely conclusive, is the fact that no extant papyri of the third and second centuries before Christ, and perhaps none of the first century within the Alexandrine Age, show any exegetical commentary in connection with a text edition; of the papyri which, somewhat later in date, do have more or less in the way of scholia, none has anything like the relative amount of scholia that the works of Didymus and Symmachus would show; the fact, again, that extant remains down to the fourth century after Christ bear witness that only a few papyrus manuscripts of Greek authors were annotated in the

manner of early parchment and later paper manuscripts with which we are familiar, and that the scholia in these were relatively brief and meager.

The proof that they were separate works, unprovided with the text of the author but furnished with lemmata, is indubitable: remains are extant of papyri written in the first century before Christ and in each of the first four centuries of the Christian era which contain commentaries of this sort, on Homer preeminently, but also on Herodotus, Thucydides, Aristophanes, Plato, Demosthenes, Aristotle, and Callimachus. Each of these cases Professor White takes up in more or less detail. There are few traces of the separate commentary in the papyrus roll after the third century of the Christian era. Papyrus gave way to parchment in the course of time and the roll gave way to the codex. These changes promoted convenience and permanence. The parchment seems to have prevailed over the papyrus by the fourth century after Christ. These facts lead Professor White to the very plausible hypothesis that the archetype of all the extant manuscripts of Aristophanes was written in the fourth or the fifth century of the Christian era, that it was a parchment codex, and that it contained both the text of Aristophanes and the commentary or scholia. From the encouragement given to Greek scholarship at this time at Constantinople, and especially from the appreciation shown there for the comedies of Aristophanes, he infers that the work was done at Constantinople.

It is clear that this anonymous editor of this first parchment codex did not have before him the commentary of Didymus; for, if he had had it, he would have quoted from Didymus directly instead of quoting through the mediumship of Symmachus. Moreover, this editor acknowledges in his subscription that he had used Symmachus, but makes no mention of Didymus. Probably this editor did not have any of the older commentators—Euphronius, Aristophanes of Byzantium, Callimachus, Aristarchus, and Crates; else he would probably have noted that fact, as he noted the use of the commentary of Symmachus. It looks as if the notes ascribed to the scholars who immediately followed Didymus, namely Apion, Seleucus, and Epaphroditus, may well have been taken from them at first hand, instead of being taken from Symmachus's use of them. At any rate, the name of Symmachus is not linked with their names, in the commentary, as it is with the name of Didymus. In the subscription to the manuscript acknowledgment is made to 'others'. The scholars meant are probably those mentioned by name in the scholia who lived later than the time of Didymus—namely, Irenaeus, Apollonius Dyscolus, Herodian, Telephus, Phrynichus, Palamedes, Athenaeus, Sallustius, Phaeinus, and others whose names are not mentioned. To Phaeinus has sometimes been ascribed the credit of having written this parchment codex. Professor White disposes of this view very summarily by calling attention to "the despicable quality of the few notes

on a single play to which his name is attached" (the *Equites*), and by noting that Greek commentators do not name themselves thus formally in their own notes.

Evidence, found largely in the existing scholia themselves, shows that this parchment codex of Aristophanes contained at least our eleven plays, and had more abundant scholia than are found in any of our existing manuscripts. This last statement is proved by the wealth of material in Suidas that is not found in any of our scholia of Aristophanes. At some time this parchment codex, the archetype of all our complete manuscripts of Aristophanes, was lost, but not until a copy or copies of it had been made. With the revival of learning in the ninth century Aristophanes was studied again and, beginning with the next century, or a little later, manuscripts were written that have been saved to us. A comparison of these manuscripts shows such agreement in mistakes in the body of the text and such similarity in the scholia as to prove that they are all descended from one archetype; whereas papyrus fragments of manuscripts of the third, fourth, and fifth centuries show, in some respects, a different tradition.

The earliest and best full testimony for the text of Aristophanes and for commentary upon Aristophanes is found in the Codex Ravennas, of the last part of the tenth or the beginning of the eleventh century, and in the Codex Venetus. The Venetus is "the fullest and most trustworthy source of the old scholia of the seven comedies it contains". Suidas is also very valuable in giving us comments that are missing in the manuscripts of Aristophanes themselves. In the twelfth century there began, at the hands of Tzetzes, a contamination of the manuscripts of Aristophanes. He started in to 'improve' them. In the fourteenth century came two other commentators on Aristophanes—Thomas Magister and Demetrius Triclinius. Some of their notes have become imbedded in the later manuscripts.

There are fifteen manuscripts that contain all or nearly all of the Aves. Five of these have no scholia. The scholia of the other ten are given in the collation, in so far as the scholia are old. The newer scholia are given, in large part, in Supplementary Notes. There follows in the Introduction a brief statement of each codex used, with some account of the characteristics of its hand or hands, and an estimate of its value. This part of the Introduction ends with a description of the editio princeps of Musurus. This edition presented a good collection of scholia, though the sources of these scholia are not given, and in some instances are unknown even now.

The reviewer has given this long account of the Introduction for several reasons. In the first place, there is found in this treatise a lucid, full, and generally convincing account of the work done on Aristophanes by scholars from the earliest times down to the time of the printed edition. Secondly, we learn to appreciate the soundness of judgment of the editor, combined

with his accuracy of scholarship, so that we feel that we can depend upon him in the fields where we cannot follow him so closely. Besides, this Introduction can be read with great pleasure and profit by all, whereas the body of the work is for reference or class-room work.

As a kind of Appendix to the Introduction, though it is not thus designated in the book, comes a very detailed account of the manuscripts that have been collated, with a careful statement of their contents, the number of folios, position of scholia, etc., together with a bibliography of their study and investigation. The manuscripts thus described are: Venetus CCCCLXXIV (V), Venetus CCCCLXXV (G), Ravennas 137, 4, A (R), Laurentianus XXXI 15 (Γ), Leidensis 52 (Γ: originally part of the preceding), Estensis III D 8 (E), Ambrosianus L 39 sup. (M), Urbinas 141 (U), Parisinus 2717 (C: this has only a few scholia and glosses and is given in the Supplementary Notes, and not in the main collation), Ambrosianus L 41 sup. (M 9: this has scholia of no independent value, as they are rewritings of the notes in Codex E; samples of these scholia are given in the pages immediately following the Supplementary Notes), Estensis III D 14 (E 2: the scholia in this manuscript have no independent value; they are printed in the pages immediately following those devoted to the manuscript just preceding). To these are added the Editio Princeps (P).

While the Introduction is the most valuable part of the book for the general reader and for the uncritical student of Aristophanes, it is, of course, the edition of the scholia themselves, which includes a transcript of the Venetus manuscript, and a collation of all the important manuscripts of these scholia, and the critical notes that make this book important. Just here, however, the ordinary reviewer finds himself at a great disadvantage. To give an accurate and valuable opinion as to the precise worth of this edition would involve a repetition of most of the vast amount of work done by the editor himself; it would mean a comparison of the transcript of the Venetus with the facsimile of the manuscript itself, and also a collation of the manuscripts that have been used in the collation itself. This the reviewer has neither the ability nor the time to do. He feels, however, that he may speak with some weight, for he has read through all the transcript, all the critical notes, and all the final text. The accuracy manifest in the part he has read gives assurance of the accuracy, at least in general, of the part that he has not read.

In his Conjectural Readings now first Proposed of the Text of the Scholia on the Aves (civ-cx) the editor enumerates about two hundred and thirty readings. Most of these are his own. About thirty suggestions or conjectures are ascribed to Professor Capps, about a dozen each to Professors Wright and Jackson, and a few each to Professor Gulick, Dr. Cary, and Mr. Byington. One might be inclined to

suspect, from this rather long list, that Professor White had been obliged to apply the "scalpel" often, as "the only instrument of salvation". However, investigation shows that the scalpel is not used so very often, after all. Some of the conjectural readings offered by the editor himself are not accepted in the text: e.g. in the first argument, *τούτου*, conjectured for the manuscript reading *τοῦδε τοῦ* (*τοῦδε*); in the third argument, *πέτραις*, conjectured for the manuscript reading *Ἀθήναις* (this conjecture receives weight from the fact that in the preceding argument *πέτραις* is read in the manuscript); on verse 11, *γινώσκοντα*, conjectured for the manuscript reading *γινώσκειν*; on verse 43, *ταῦτα*, conjectured for the manuscript reading *αὐτά*; etc. Some of the readings given in the list of conjectures offered by the cooperating scholars are really, as the editor himself states, the manuscript readings, which had been rejected by editors, but are now offered again, with a different punctuation or with a new suggestion as to a word to be supplied. One of these, at least, is accepted by the editor: on verse 66, *καὶ μὴν ἐρώτα*. *τὰ πρὸς πόδω* *σαφέστερα* (Jackson). Two are not accepted by the editor: on verse 11, Professor Wright would keep the manuscript reading, *ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἕτερος*, believing that *στίχος* or *τόπος* is to be supplied (Professor White reads here in the text his own emendation, *ἔστι δὲ κἄν ἑτέροις*, which is approximately the emendation of Bergk); on verse 807 Jackson would read, with the manuscripts, *ὡς δ' ἔστι*, and then punctuate with a comma after *πτερώματος* (here, Professor White accepts the reading of Suidas, *ὅδ' ἔστι*).

Many of the changes are slight and relatively unimportant: e.g. on verse 63 Professor White reads *οὕτως τι* (here the Venetus has *οὕτωσι τι*, while R has *οὕτωσι τι*, and E has *οὕτω ὅστι*, and Γ has *τέ οὐ* for *τι*); on verse 701 Professor White reads *τῆς* for the manuscript reading *τᾶς*.

The question may well be asked at this time, What is the value of this new edition? Several values are to be assigned to it. First and foremost, whether this proves to be, to all intents and purposes, a final edition of the scholia of the Aves or not—and it is hard to decide with accuracy when a final edition of any work has been made—it certainly offers practically all the known material for making such an edition and would be itself a worthy final edition. In the next place, it offers the first complete and authoritative transcript of the Venetus Manuscript. Dindorf's edition claimed to give all the variant readings of the Venetus as well as of the Ravennas. It is manifest now, however, that Dindorf did not give, with any very great accuracy, an account of the readings of the Venetus. Finally, by this edition Professor White has cleared up many difficulties in the reading and the interpretation of the scholia.

Let me amplify a little the points just made. In the first place, taking the Venetus as his basis, Professor

White has given the variants in MSS G, R, A, Γ, E, M, U, and the Editio Princeps, besides adding, under the title of Supplementary Notes, even the more recent comments in MSS Γ, E, M, U, C, and the Editio Princeps, a Transcript of the Notes in E 9, and a Transcript of the notes on six folios in M 9. He has also given the variant readings of A and Pal 67 (Vp2) for the introductory matter contained in the scholia (these manuscripts have no scholia on the body of the Aves itself). To these statements might be added the fact that much information has been brought to bear on the form and interpretation of the text from Suidas primarily, and to some extent from the other lexicographers. In the second place, the inaccuracy of former editions in their references to the readings of the Venetus is seen from various statements by Professor White. In his comments on the Second Argument he says,

This argument is read in V (G) E and the Princeps. Statements that it is late (Dindorf, Blaydes) and that it is not read in V (Dübner, Blaydes, Hall and Geldart, van Leeuwen) require correction. Brunck and Bekker admit it.

In the Third Argument appears this reading, *ἔστι δὲ λέ.* Again the editor says,

the statement that this phrase is not found in V (Dindorf, Dübner, Blaydes, Hall and Geldart, van Leeuwen) requires correction.

To this may be added the remark made on the scholium on verse 303,

The help Küster desired seems to be furnished by V, which has . . . These readings were overlooked by Dindorf and his copyist Dübner.

In the next place, let the reviewer note, in the order of their appearance, a few of the important points in which Professor White has helped in text and elucidation. The editor, be it noted first, has drawn freely from Suidas, as he himself states, often amplifying existing commentary by material furnished by Suidas, and sometimes introducing whole notes, the authority for which is Suidas alone.

The editor keeps (page 8) the manuscript reading in the Fourth Argument, *ὡς εἰ πεποιθὼν ἕτερος τῷ ἑτέρῳ καὶ ἑλπίζοι ἔσεσθαι ἐν βελτίοσι*, and considers that "Both names are interpreted from the point of view of Euelpides. To say that Euelpides 'relies on' (*πέθειν*) Peithetaerus is a mode of expressing the converse fact that Peithetaerus 'wins over' (*πείθειν*) his comrade Euelpides". So he gives the name of the character throughout the scholia as *Πειθέταιρος* and not as *Πεισθέταιρος*, as the manuscripts and editors have regularly done. Both Meineke and Rutherford, who amend the passage, think that *ἕτερος* refers to Pei(s)-thetaerus; in fact, Rutherford makes the reading *<Πεισθ>έταιρος*. In the commentary on *ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ χωρᾷ*, a part of the scholium on verse 395, the editor calls attention to a mistake in Curtius (Stadtgeschichte von Athen, 120), who cites this passage "in sole support of his view that there was a sec-

tion in the Ceramicus in which those were buried who had fallen in Attica". With the help of Suidas and others, the editor is enabled to amend the scholium on verse 767 so as to make it intelligible. In the comment on the scholium of verse 1113, where the editors all read *πρόλογος*, Professor White keeps the reading of the manuscripts, *πρόλογος*, which is substantiated by the reading in the Fayûm Fragment. In the last part of a scholium on the same verse the editor makes a restoration on the authority of the same Fayûm Fragment. In his comment on the scholium of verse 1150 the editor explains the scholium, and then calls attention to the fact that Rutherford first "restores the note, so that it reads . . . and then condemns <his own restoration> as nonsense". In his note on the scholium on verse 1293 the editor suggests that *χελιδών*, "along with its varied other applications, may have signified also the *brand* of a horse,—the 'swallow brand'". In his note on the scholium on verse 1367 the editor calls attention to the fact that Rutherford misunderstood the meaning, when he translated the scholium by "They <the Athenians> are paid for military service at a higher rate than any other state". The scholium, which Professor White does not translate, evidently means 'for pay they serve as soldiers to help other states'. In the scholium on verse 1395 the editor accepts the emendation of Professor Capps, which makes a hard passage now intelligible.

There are several matters, however, that the reviewer would like to query. In the scholium on verse 121 why not accept the proposed emendation of Professor Capps, *Πυλαία ἀρχη*? it would account for the reading in the manuscripts (*Πυλαιάρχω* in V, *Πυλαιάρχο* in G), and, as the editor notes, would be paralleled by the phrase in the scholium on verse, 275, *ἐκ <τῆς> Σοφοκλέους δευτέρας τυρούς ἀρχη*. Probably the editor is influenced by the reading in Suidas, *Πυλαιαν*. In the scholium on verse 448 why should not the lemma be *ἀκούετε λεψ' τοῦς ὀπλίτας νυνμενί* or else why should not a new lemma, *νυνμενί*, be given for the last part of the scholium, which explains this phrase? In the scholium on verse 648 why should not *πάλιν* be added to the lemma, or a new lemma given consisting of that word? In the scholium on verse 701 why not keep *τάς* instead of emending to *τῆς*, so long as the manuscripts have *τάς* and the editor himself admits that it "may be right"? In verse 709 why not follow V in reading *τὸ 'Ἡσιόδειον*, as in the next lemma, instead of following the other manuscripts in reading *τὰ 'Ἡσιόδου*? In his note on the scholium on verse 719, where he changes *οἰωνοῦς* to *ὄρνις*, against the authority of the manuscripts and Suidas, the editor is not convincing. In the scholium on verse 1522 why not keep the reading of the manuscripts, *πολεμῶν* (with *ἔφασαν*), instead of substituting *πολεμήσειν*, as the editor himself admits that the manuscript reading "may be right"?

In accuracy, so far as the reviewer has been able to determine, this is the best printed book that has come under his eye for careful reading. The misprints are almost negligible.

There is left for the reviewer the subject of the three Indexes: I. Greek Words (327-344); II. Subjects treated in the Introduction, Arguments, Scholia, and Notes (345-373); III. Greek Authors cited in the Arguments and Scholia on the Aves (375-378). In Appendix I are included glosses, the technical language of critics and grammarians, new words, words in new or unusual meanings, and—"so far as practicable"—syntax. The proof of an Index is in the using, and the reviewer does not pretend that he has used these Indexes fully. He has read them through, however, and he has tested them fairly carefully for the matter in the Introduction. As a result, he finds the following facts and makes the following queries. The basis for the inclusion or exclusion of a name or a fact has been hard to ascertain. Certain names or facts about those names, that appear in the Introduction, are not seen in the Indexes where one might expect to find them—e.g. Tzetzes, page xxx; Calvisius, *ibid.*; Varro, xxxii; Serapeum, xxxiii; Ptolemy Epiphanes and Ptolemy Philometor, xxxviii; Didymus the Younger, xxxix; Timotheus, xlix; Paeon of Isyllus, xlix, footnote 3; Seleucus, l, footnote 4; commentaries on Aristarchus, lviii; scholia Didymi of Homer, lx, is given under Homer but not under Didymus; Didymus, lxx; Photius and Arethas, lxxii; Porphyrogenitus, lxxiii. This list does not claim to be complete. Very likely these names or references were omitted through the application of some fixed principle. If so, that principle might well have been stated. Or the indexer might say that, to keep the Indexes down to reasonable limits, he was obliged to omit some references, following his own best judgment. In that case one might go back over the list just given, and maintain that the judgment had not been unerring. But whose judgment is unerring?

Occasionally there is a difference in treatment in the Index of words or subjects that are brought together in the Introduction. So, in the Introduction, lvii, the author says,

Each of the remaining annotated papyri of the second century contains, as (*sic*) in general, only a few brief marginal notes. There are fragments of the Meliambi of Cercidas; of Sophocles's Ichneutae and Eurypylus, on which the brief annotation is mainly textual . . .

In the Index we read under Sophocles, page 372, "marginal notes in an early papyrus MS. of the Ichneutae and Eurypylus lvii"; whereas we read under Cercidas, page 351, "marginal notes in an early papyrus MS. of lvii". Here there is no reference to the nature of the work, the Meliambi. Perhaps this difference of treatment was accorded because of the more definite name of the works of Sophocles and an indication merely of the character of the works of Cercidas.

In the Introduction, lxvii, we find this sentence,

As to the scholars named in our scholia who followed Didymus in the first century, Apion, Seleucus, and Epaphroditus, it is quite as probable that the notes which are here ascribed to them were drawn by the anonymous editor directly from their works as that Symmachus furnished the quotations . . .

In the Index, page 346, under Apion, we read "may have been used directly by the compiler of the first parchment codex of Ar. lxvii"; likewise on page 372, under Seleucus, we read, "may have been used directly by the compiler of the first parchment codex of Ar. lxvii". But on page 356, under Epaphroditus, we read, "may have been used directly, *not through the medium of Symmachus*, by the compiler of the first parchment edition of Ar. lxvii, l. n. 4".

Sometimes the statement in the Index discloses the fact that it was not prepared by the author of the Introduction himself. So, on page xxii of the Introduction occur these words,

. . . Artemidorus of Tarsus, in the first century before Christ, compiled a lexicon that seems to have been *confined* to comedy<sup>1</sup>.

In Index II, page 348, we have ". . . Artemidorus of Tarsus, author of a lexicon that *dealt largely* with comedy xxii"<sup>1</sup>. Again, on page xxviii the author cites the scholium of Didymus on verse 149 as topographical. In Index III, page 376, we read, "Didymus, notes on the Aves: grammar and etymology 58, 149, 1121, 1283". On page xlix the editor says,

It is *possible* that Aristophanes formulated the metrical system of which the chief exponents for us are now Heliodorus and Hephaestion . . ."<sup>1</sup>

On page 348, in the Index, we read, under the name of Aristophanes of Byzantium, these words, "*probably* the formulator of the Alexandrian metrical system of Heliodorus and Hephaestion xlix"<sup>1</sup>. These are, of course, only slight flaws. Still, we have here a slight lack of what we might call 'good team work'.

Still, these very valuable Indexes show in every page and column the scholarship of a man who knows his Greek literature and who can thread his way through the maze of difficulties that abound in the scholia of Aristophanes.

Taking it all in all the reviewer doubts if a book more creditable to the best American classical scholarship has ever appeared. Long life to the able editor to continue—and to finish—the great work that he is doing for a better understanding of the Greek Classics in general and of Aristophanes in particular! This is the heartfelt wish of the reviewer, who desires, at this time, to pay his tribute of affection and respect to his *magister* of aforetime, through whom he got his first glimpse of the real power of the great comic poet.

WILLIAMS COLLEGE.

GEORGE EDWIN HOWES.

<sup>1</sup>The Italics are the reviewer's.